

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter, Figures 1-5).

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Yoo et al.* (USPN 6,639,636).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 13, and has added new claims 18-19. Claims 1-19 are presently pending.

**The Disposition of the Claims**

**(i) The rejection based on APA**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Prior Art (APA hereinafter, Figures 1-5). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 13, as previously presented or as amended, Applicant respectfully submit that APA teaches or suggests a combination wherein a main support surrounding a plurality of lamps. The Office Action appears to suggest that support sides 18 of Figures 1-5 of APA are a "main support" as claimed. Applicants respectfully disagree. The support sides 18 do not surround the lamps. Specifically, as shown in Figures 2 and 5B, the two support sides 18 lack any interconnection and, therefore, do not surround the lamps. Here, it is noted that Figure 4 shows a jig 28 that is used only during assembly to hold the support sides

18 until the lamps are inserted. As described in paragraph [0018] and shown in Figure 5C, the jig 28 is removed. That is, the jig 28 does not constitute any part of an LCD module because the jig 28 is removed. In Figure 5C, the members disposed parallel to the lamps are the edges of the bottom cover. Thus, the LCD module of APA lacks any structure that can be considered to be a main support surrounding a plurality of lamps. As explained for example at paragraphs [0019] and [0051], the claimed configuration facilitates arranging of the lamps, thereby easing assembly of the LCD module.

(ii) The rejection based on *Yoo et al.*

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Yoo et al.* (USPN 6,639,636). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that *Yoo et al.* does not teach or suggest a combination wherein openings of a main support receives lamp ends on a one-to-one basis. The Office Action suggests that openings 164 of bottom chassis 160 in *Yoo et al.* is a “opening” as claimed. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In contrast, each opening 164 of *Yoo et al.* receive multiple lamp ends rather than receiving lamp ends on a one-to-one basis. As explained for example at paragraphs [0019] and [0051], the claimed configuration facilitates arranging of the lamps, thereby easing assembly of the LCD module.

# # # # #

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 13, as amended are allowable. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-12 and 14-17 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

**New Claims 18-19**

Applicant has added new dependent claims 18-19 to further define the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that new dependent claims 18-19 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, as well as the features recited therein.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: 

Robert J. Goodell

Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: March 1, 2007

**CUSTOMER NO.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202-739-3000

Fax: 202-739-3001